

## How Far Likeness Can Go: Grammaticalization of *Kath-* in Korean<sup>\*</sup>

SEONGHA RHEE

*Hankuk University of Foreign Studies · Stanford University*

### 0. Introduction

Grammaticalization of linguistic forms denoting ‘likeness’, e.g. ‘similarity’, ‘resemblance’, ‘equality’, etc. into various grammatical markers has been attested in a number of languages. Such markers include complementizer, comparative marker, epistemic modality marker, concessive marker, etc. (Heine et al. 1993, Heine and Kuteva 2002). The verb *kath-* in Korean primarily denotes ‘be identical’ as a lexical verb, but it shows on-going grammaticalization into particles, connectives, and sentential endings, which seems to be a process that began recently. These new grammatical forms mark various kinds of the ‘likeness’ concept. This paper describes from a grammaticalization perspective the emergence of such grammatical forms and some related changes as a consequence of the grammaticalization of the verb *kath-*.

### 1. Semantics of *kath-*

Since *kath-* in contemporary Korean denotes ‘identicalness’ and ‘similarity’, we shall first need to establish that the original semantics of the verb is ‘identicalness’ in order to show that all the semantics of the grammaticalized markers is derived from this original sense.

In historical data, the use of the verb *kath-* is attested in both the ‘identicalness’ sense and the ‘similarity’ sense. There have been about ten different forms, such as *kAthA-*, *kAt-*, *kAtthA-*, *kAsthu-*, *kAshu-*, *kAthu-*, *kethu-*, and *kath-*. These forms were mostly typographical free variations without semantic differences, but their formal differences are also due to diachronic sound change, largely occurring in the order given above and the last one being the only form used in contemporary Korean. A large number of available historical sources are Buddhist and Confucian scripture commentaries and translations, and if we compare them with Chinese versions, we see that the corresponding Chinese characters were those signifying identicalness (*tong* or *tung*) and similarity (*ye*, *sa* or *ilpan*).

---

<sup>\*</sup> This work was supported by a 2004 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.

In the contemporary data, when *kath-* is used lexically, both the ‘identicalness’ sense and the ‘similarity’ sense are attested. However, the typical case is where the verb means identicalness, i.e., it is referring to the same referent, as in (1), even though there are cases whose meaning is ambiguous between identicalness of the referent and similarity between the referents by virtue of their belonging to the same category, as in (2).<sup>1</sup>

- (1)    *kath-un*                    {*kohyang*, *kaps*, *seng*}  
       same-Adnom            hometown, price, surname  
       ‘the same hometown/price/surname’
- (2)    *kath-un*                    {*umsik*, *cha*, *nalssi*}  
       same-Adnom            food, car, weather  
       ‘the same food/car/weather’ or ‘similar food/car/weather’

Despite the fact that ‘identicalness’ and ‘similarity’ are both attested in the historical and contemporary data, however, there are reasons to believe that the lexical verb *kath-* was originally associated with the ‘identicalness’ sense. The first comes from the frequency in the historical data, which show that when the verb is used as the main verb its meaning is predominantly ‘identicalness’. On the other hand, when it is used as a postpositional particle grammaticalized from the main verb, infrequent as it is in the historical data previous to modern Korean, its meaning is often ‘similarity’, which suggests the semantic extension from ‘identicalness’ to ‘similarity’. The second reason is that even in contemporary Korean the usage in the ‘identicalness’ sense shows less syntactic constraints, i.e., it occurs either attributively or predicatively, unlike the usage in the ‘similarity’ sense, which occurs largely attributively and often renders sentences unnatural if used predicatively. This suggests that the ‘similarity’ use is new, because it has been widely accepted that syntactically, at the incipient stage of grammaticalization, grammaticalizing forms arise out of very local contexts (Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]:2). Still another reason is that native speakers intuitively associate the verb *kath-* with the ‘identicalness’ sense and use different verbs, e.g. *pisusha-*, *yusaha-*, etc., for a true ‘similarity’ sense.

As will become obvious in the following discussion, the grammaticalized meanings from this verb are basically ‘similarity’, not ‘identicalness’. If we take for granted that ‘identicalness’ is semantically more specific than ‘similarity’, i.e., ‘similarity’ is more general than ‘identicalness’, in the sense that ‘identicalness’ is the extreme case of ‘similarity’, then the semantic development of this verb in the course of grammaticalization is in consonance with the theses that grammaticalizing words undergo semantic generalization (Bybee et al. 1994), and that such

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in glosses: Adnom: adnominal; Conjec: conjectural; Dec: declarative; Exclam: exclamative; Fut: future; Hort: hortative; Hypoth: hypothetical; NF: non-finite connective; Nom: nominative; Pcl: particle; Perf: perfective; Q: interrogative; and Retros: retrospective.

semantic generality is often a prerequisite for grammaticalization (see Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], *inter alia*, for discussions on semantic generality with respect to grammaticalization).

## **2. Grammaticalization of *kath-***

Grammaticalization is a process that often occurs in specific contexts of use. There are diverse syntagmatic configurations in which *kath-* can be used, but grammaticalization occurs only in structures where *kath-* has strong syntagmatic and semantic ties with the adjacent materials, as e.g. in the context where *kath-* occurs close to its argument marked by *-wa* ‘with’. Since *kath-* takes two or more noun phrases as objects of comparisons, one of them usually being the sentential subject and the other an oblique argument marked with *-wa*, these two forms *-wa* and *kath-* frequently occur in juxtaposition. However, this is not always the case because the verb *kath-* may predicate of plural subjects, where the subject may be a plural noun or two or more noun phrases combined with *-wa* ‘and’. In this case the verb *kath-* does not show any sign of grammaticalization. This reflects the fact that if two or more linguistic forms should be perceived as a single unit, there should be some kind of close relationship between them. In Lehmann’s (1995 [1982]) terms, the forms in a construction undergo ‘coalescence’ and increase the ‘bondedness’ as the construction grammaticalizes (see also Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]).

In grammatical uses of *kath-*, there are two formal changes that signal that the form has departed, or is in the process of departing, from its original lexical status. The first change involves compacting of the construction, evidenced by orthographic space deletion by many people, despite the fact that Korean orthographic regulation mandates spacing between word groups, which, in this case, is spacing between *kath-* and its preceding particle *-wa*. This suggests that the word groups are reanalyzed as a single unit (cf. Lord 1973, Traugott 1980, Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993]). There is no change in terms of linear order but the mental bracketing by the language users becomes different.

The other change involves phonological erosion. The most obvious erosion is the particle deletion from the reanalyzed construction including a particle. This results in a syntagmatic condition where *kath-* and its oblique argument occur without intervention of the oblique marker, thus paving the way for *kath-* to be affixed to the preceding noun phrase directly, a process called particularization (Matisoff 1991). A more subtle reductive process involves a suprasegmental feature, i.e. stress: *kath-*, which could be stressed as a lexical verb, cannot be stressed any longer. Phonological reduction or attrition of integrity has been widely recognized as a common concomitant of grammaticalization (Lehmann 1995[1982], Hopper and Traugott 2003[1993], Bybee et al. 1994, *inter alia*).

### **2.1. Particles**

Two forms derived from *kath-* develop into particles denoting various concepts of ‘likeness’. One is the particle *-(wa)kathun* ‘like, such as, resembling, etc.’ derived

from *-wa kathun*, whose morphological make-up can be broken down into *-wa kath-un*, where the final morpheme *-un* is an adnominal marker. This construction becomes an adjectivizer, i.e., it affixes to a noun phrase and modifies another noun phrase. What makes the form an adjectivizer is the final particle *-un* at the end of the original construction. In grammaticalizing constructions in Korean, and probably in other typologically similar languages as well, the participating particles play important roles in determining the grammatical status of the final product (Rhee 2003). It is so because, despite phonological erosion and its consequent formal opacity, the morphosyntactic configuration and function are preserved. The adjectivizing particle *-(wa)kathun* signifies various ‘likeness’ concepts such as MEMBERSHIP, for listing exemplars; SIMILARITY, for presenting an object with similar properties; and QUALIFICATION, for naming a category to which the object concerned rightfully belongs, as shown in the examples in (3).

- (3) a. MEMBERSHIP  
 mantwu-na kwukswu-(wa)kathun umsik  
 dumpling-or noodle-Pcl food  
 ‘the food, for example, dumplings and noodles’
- b. SIMILARITY  
 yong-kathun pawl  
 dragon-Pcl rock  
 ‘a rock resembling a dragon, a dragon-shaped rock’
- c. QUALIFICATION  
 mal-kathun mal  
 saying-Pcl saying  
 ‘a saying that may be called as a saying, a noteworthy remark’

Since ‘likeness’ is inherently a gradient notion, the senses can be plotted along the continuum from SAME to DIFFERENT as in (4).

- (4) SAME-----SIMILAR-----DIFFERENT  
 identical >> of same kind (member) >> similar >> qualified for inclusion

The movement of senses from the left to the right of the continuum can be characterized as semantic generalization, where the last sense ‘qualified for inclusion’ can be said to border on the sense DIFFERENT because, even though in a sense all likeness should be based on the contrast with difference, the contrast should be more focused in this case. Figuratively, as sameness gradually fades, it takes on difference.

One thing to note here is that there still exists fluidity among these newly created ‘likeness’ senses. For example, MEMBERSHIP and QUALIFICATION can be encoded by *-(wa)kathun*, as is illustrated in (5).

- (5) MEMBERSHIP/QUALIFICATION ambiguity  
 mantwu-na kwukswu-(wa)kathun umsik  
 dumpling-or noodle-Pcl food  
 MEMBERSHIP: ‘the food, for example, dumplings and noodles’  
 QUALIFICATION: ‘such food as dumplings or noodles’

Despite the fluidity allowing for ambiguity, there is a tendency of correlation between MEMBERSHIP and *-wakathun*, and QUALIFICATION and *-kathun*. Since the MEMBERSHIP sense, in contrast with the QUALIFICATION sense, resembles parenthetical use of the modifier phrase, it can be said that the syntagmatic tie with MEMBERSHIP use is weaker than that with the QUALIFICATION use. This is in line with the observation that grammaticalization largely accompanies morpho-syntactic tightening.

The other particle developed from *kath-* is *-(wa)kathi* ‘with, as, etc.’, derived from *-wa kath-i*, where the last particle *-i* is the adverbializer. As is the case with the previously discussed adjectivizer *-(wa)kathun*, the final particle in the original construct plays a crucial role in determining the grammatical status of this newly developed marker, i.e., the new form carries the adverbializing function, as shown in (6).

- (6) a. *-wa kathi* COMITATIVE  
 b. *-(wa) kathi* NON-DISSIMILARITY  
 c. *-kathi* SIMILARITY  
 d. *-kathi* EMPHATIC

The comitative marker *-wa kathi* has a variant form, *-hako kathi*. The particles *-wa* and *-hako* are connective particles (equivalent to ‘and’) for nominal connection in enumeration. The newly emerging adverbial meanings are shown again on the likeness continuum in (7), and in the examples in (8).

- (7) SAME-----SIMILAR-----DIFFERENT  
 identical >> of same location/appearance/quality >> non-dissimilar

- (8) a. COMITATIVE  
 accessi-wakathi kongwen-ey ka-ss-ta  
 uncle-Pcl park-to go-Past-Dec  
 ‘(I) went to the park with (my) uncle.’  
 b. SIMILARITY  
 sinsa-kathi yeyuypalukey hayngtonghay-la  
 gentleman-Pcl courteously behave-Imp  
 ‘Act courteously like a gentleman.’

c. EMPHATIC

saypyek-kathi talli-e o-ass-ta  
dawn-Pcl run-NF come-Past-Dec  
'(He) came very early in the morning.'

d. NON-DISSIMILARITY

kwayen yeysanghay-ss-te-n kes-kathi  
indeed expect-Past-Retros-Adnom thing-Pcl  
'as (we) expected indeed'

The semantics of COMITATIVE is based on similarity by virtue of being in the same location. This marker seems to be one of the earliest forms that developed from *kath-*, but it has undergone the least formal change in the sense that the intervening particle *-wa* cannot be omitted. Interestingly, the connective particle can function as a COMITATIVE marker, and therefore, *-kathi* is semantically redundant. This suggests that *-kathi* is semantically bleached without creating much redundancy. The SIMILARITY sense in (8b) usually refers to likeness in appearance, whereas the EMPHATIC sense in (8c) refers to likeness in quality, usually associated with time expressions and some other highly fossilized expressions. The NON-DISSIMILARITY sense in (8d), which may seem extraordinary for separate semantic designation, is recognized as such by lexicographers and is listed in major dictionaries. This sense is formed with reference to the opposing pole of DIFFERENT, and therefore, goes well with adverbs *kwayen* 'indeed' and *yeksi* 'indeed'.

## 2.2. Sentential Endings

The structure *-wa kath-* develops into two sentential endings *-keskath-* and *-kathuni-*: the former is a CONJECTURAL which marks estimated identicalness; whereas the latter is an EXCLAMATIVE which marks 'likeness' in exclamation. These two markers share the same function of sentential endings, but their source structures and syntactic behavior are vastly different.

The CONJECTURAL marker *-keskath-* contains *kes* 'thing', a semantically-bleached defective noun modified by a preceding relative clause. Through reanalysis, however, this embedded clause becomes the main clause, and the main verb *kath-* becomes a sentential modal ending, which marks the speaker's modal attitude toward the proposition. One consequence of this syntagmatic reanalysis is that this newly emerged grammatical marker has variant forms for more fine-grained semantic designations depending on differences in tense and aspect of the proposition, such as *-l-keskath* for future, *-un-keskath* for perfective, and *-nun-keskath* for present/progressive, with different functions of the prefixed adnominal markers. These modal marking sentential endings attenuate the assertive force of propositions by making a statement a mere conjecture, as shown in the examples in (9).



(9) CONJECTURAL

- a. pi-ka            o-l-keskath-ta  
rain-Nom    come-Fut.Adnom-Conjec-Dec  
'It looks like rain. It seems that it will rain.'
- b. ku-ka            cwuk-un-keskath-ta  
he-Nom      die-Perf.Adnom-Conjec-Dec  
'He seems to have died. It seems that he died.'
- c. cencayng-i   na-nun-keskath-ta  
war-Nom    come.out-Pres.Adnom-Conj-Dec  
'A war seems to be breaking out. It seems that a war is breaking out.'

On the other hand, the EXCLAMATIVE marker *-kathuni* has a different source structure. It is directly affixed to a noun like a particle. Unlike particles, however, it marks the sentential ending, an odd behavior from a syntactic point of view. It does not inflect for tense-aspect-modality or formality-honorification level designation, another odd behavior for a sentential ending in Korean. All these oddities are due to the process it underwent in the course of grammaticalization. This EXCLAMATIVE marker *kath-* has a longer variant form, *-kathunilakwu*, which contains a constellation of connectives including *-uni*. In fact, *-uni* 'as, since, because' is a clausal connective now appearing utterance-finally due to ellipsis of the main clause. With this structural reanalysis, these connectives become sentential endings. Korean seems to use ellipsis extensively for creation of sentential endings out of connectives, because the elided structures actively engage the addressee and invite pragmatic inferences (Rhee 2002). These EXCLAMATIVES are often used to label someone based on his/her behavioral quality with emphasis by claiming his/her qualification for inclusion in the named category, an instance of subjectification (Traugott 1980, 2003), as shown in (10).

(10) EXCLAMATIVE

- celen    nappu-n    nom-kathuni!
- Such    bad-Adnom fellow-Exclam
- 'What a wretched fellow (he is)!'

Considering that the example (10) is originally an elliptical structure, it is tantamount to saying, 'Since (he) is so much like wretched fellows like that, how can I {trust him, like him, etc.}?'

### 2.3. Clausal Connectives

There are some clausal connectives developed from *kath-*, such as *-kathumyen*, *-kath(tel)ato*, *-kathasen(un)*, etc., all marking HYPOTHETICALITY with slightly different shades of meaning. All these forms are products of combination with other connective particles such as CONDITIONAL *-myen* 'if', CAUSAL *-ase*

‘because’, and CONCESSIVES *-telato* and *-ato* ‘even though’. The semantics of *kath-* here is bleached and is similar to a copula, simply establishing a ‘likeness’ connection between realis and irrealis as a ground for apodosis, as in (11).

- (11) HYPOTHETICAL  
 ne-kathumyen ettehkey ha-keyss-ni?  
 You-Hypoth how do-Fut-Q  
 ‘If you were (me), what would you do?’

## 2.4. Adverb

Now we turn to the development of an adverb from the verb *kath-*. It has been controversial whether formation of adverbs should be considered a grammaticalization process, because the final product has many characteristics of lexical items rather than of grammatical items. This paper, however, will consider the formation of adverbs from verbs to be instances of grammaticalization, based on the fact that adverbs are more toward the grammatical side of the lexical-grammatical continuum as compared with verbs (see Heine et al. 1993 for a similar position).

The original structure *-wa kathi* develops into an adverb, *kathi* ‘together’. This development is due to omission of the contextually implicit *X-wa* ‘with X’, i.e. from *X-wa kathi* ‘together with X’ to *kathi* ‘together’.

One notable aspect of this process is the directionality. This development is from a complex postpositional particle to an adverb. According to the general directionality involving emergence of adverbs, adverbs develop into adpositions, not the opposite. Likewise, the bondedness that existed between the host noun phrase and the complex postpositional particle is now lost with the development of an adverb, which does not host a noun phrase. An example of *kathi* is (12):

- (12) ADVERB  
 kathi mek-ca  
 together eat-Hort  
 ‘Let’s eat together. (Literally: ‘Let’s eat samely.’)’

## 3. Related Changes

### 3.1. Derived Lexicalization

Along with the grammaticalization discussed above, there are lexicalization processes involving *kath-* that may have to do with the grammaticalization of *kath-*. There are four verbs that come to our attention as listed in (13).

- (13) *ttokkath-* ‘be exactly same, be identical’  
*kkokkath-* ‘be exactly same, be identical’  
*kathcanh-* ‘be insignificant, be unseemly’  
*kathiha-* ‘share the situation’



Of the four verbs listed above, *ttokkath-* and *kkokkath-* are derived from a combination of the verb *kath-* with an onomatopoeic prefix *ttok-* and *kkok-* describing a hitting or pointing action with a sharp-pointed object, or a breaking noise of a brittle object. This derivation seems to be a restorative process to reinforce the bleached ‘sameness’ meaning originally associated with *kath-*. If this is truly the case, it is an interesting phenomenon in that the lexical verb *kath-*, unlike its grammaticalized derivatives, is still mainly denoting ‘sameness’, and therefore suggests that grammaticalized forms diverged from the source verb can still influence the lexical source verb, since it has been thought that diverged forms usually take independent paths of development.

The third verb, *kathcanh-*, incorporates a negation marker *-an-* and a light verb *ha-* ‘do’, rendering the combinatory meaning of the original source structure as ‘be not same’ or literally ‘do not be same’, which, however, changed to ‘be insignificant, be unseemly’ (see Lee 2002 for a discussion of a similar process in Korean). In this newly created word, the verb *kath-* participating as a component in it, no longer has its original meaning. In fact, the lexicalization process is so complete that the new word neither takes any oblique-marked argument (despite the presence of the verb *kath-*); nor does it take any accusative-marked argument (despite the presence of the transitive verb *ha-*); nor does it show contrast with a non-negation-marked counterpart, i.e. *kath-*, or co-occur with a negative polarity item (despite the presence of the negative *-an-*).

The last verb, *kathiha-*, was originally a construction containing a light verb *ha-* ‘do’. Its compositional meaning ‘do in the same manner’ or ‘do together’ has changed into ‘to share’, such as ‘share the same fate/responsibilities/pain/etc.’, in the lexicalization process.

### 3.2. Specialization

Considering that the grammaticalization of the verb *kath-* is rather a recent development, it would be worthwhile to take a look at how these grammaticalized or grammaticalizing forms fare in the grammar of contemporary Korean, i.e., specialization of the new forms and their competitors, or, figuratively, the struggle for survival among the linguistic forms.

For quantitative comparison, two corpora were used: the *Sinsosel* Corpus and the KAIST KORTERM Corpus. *Sinsosel* is a special genre in Korean literature, linking the classical fiction and the modern fiction. They were written between 1906 and 1917, and there are about 30 of them, 21 of which are used in this corpus, by compiling them in a single word-processing document. The statistics relevant to *kath-* are given in Table 1, representing the early 20<sup>th</sup> century data. The second corpus, the KAIST KORTERM Corpus, contains more than 13 million words from diverse source materials of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. Due to its tagging inconsistency, however, the statistics given here are re-calculated based on the percentage of each form in samples, and thus some of the figures have been rounded.

In interpreting the statistics in the tables, it should be borne in mind that the absolute figures cannot be compared across the tables because the two corpora are considerably different in size, and they do not represent the same resource types in terms of genres, registers, etc.

Table 1: Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century (The *Sinsosel* Corpus: 305,550 words)

Function	Label	Form	Frequency	Competitor	Frequency
particle of similarity	Adjectivizer	<i>-kathun</i>	504	∅	
		<i>-wa kathun</i>	10		
particle of similarity	Adverbializer	<i>-kathi</i>	703	<i>-chelem</i>	110
particle of accompaniment	Comitative	<i>-wa kathi</i>	208	<i>-wa hamkkey</i>	7
clausal connection	Hypothetical Conditional	<i>-kathumyen</i> etc.	155		
sentential ending	Exclamative Ending	<i>-kathuni</i>	22		
sentential ending	Attenuative Modal Ending	<i>-kes kath-</i>	167	<i>-tusha-</i>	440
				<i>-tussiph-</i>	47
adverb		<i>kathi</i>	178	<i>hamkkey</i>	17
verb		<i>kathiha-</i>	0	<i>hamkkeyha-</i>	0
verb		<i>kathcanh-</i>	0		
verb		<i>kkokkath-</i>	0		
verb		<i>ttokkath-</i>	12		

Table 2: Contemporary (The KAIST KORTERM Corpus: 13,605,457 words)

Function	Label	Form	Frequency	Competitor	Frequency
particle of similarity	Adjectivizer	<i>-kathun</i>	58,000	∅	
		<i>-wa kathun</i>	18,000		
particle of similarity	Adverbializer	<i>-kathi</i>	3,000	<i>-chelem</i>	14,377
particle of accompaniment	Comitative	<i>-wa kathi</i>	16,000	<i>-wa hamkkey</i>	33,000
clausal connection	Hypothetical Conditional	<i>-kathumyen</i> etc.	1,624		
sentential ending	Exclamative Ending	<i>-kathuni</i>	434		
sentential ending	Attenuative Modal Ending	<i>-kes kath-</i>	120,000 <sup>+</sup>	<i>-tusha-</i>	4,200
				<i>-tussiph-</i>	960
adverb		<i>kathi</i>	18,000	<i>hamkkey</i>	12,000
verb		<i>kathiha-</i>	891	<i>hamkkeyha-</i>	415
verb		<i>kathcanh-</i>	125		
verb		<i>kkokkath-</i>	13		
verb		<i>ttokkath-</i>	841		

Comparing grammaticalized markers of *kath-* with their competitors in Tables 1 and 2, we can see the following interesting facts.

Adjectivizer particles of similarity, *-wakathun* and *-kathun*, have no competitors and are used very productively. On the other hand, the adverbializer particle of similarity, *-kathi*, is losing primacy to its competitor *-chelem*, which was developed from *-thyeylo* ‘with body’, and so is the comitative particle of accompaniment, *-wa kathi*, to its competitor *-wa hamkkey*.

The attenuative modal sentential ending, *-keskath-*, shows explosive growth in use. Considering that its competitors were more frequently used in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the increase in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century is truly phenomenal.

It is also noteworthy that there are some parallel development patterns between *kath-* and its competitors. For example, *hamkkey* shows some parallelism in recruiting a particle *-wa* for formation of complex particles with an adverbializing function, in developing adverbs by way of particle deletion, and even in coining new verbs by compounding with a light verb.

Still another finding is that lexicalization, some of which is suspected to be a remedial strategy for semantic bleaching, is a recent development.

#### **4. Conclusions**

In this paper we have seen how *kath-* ‘same, identical’, though still retaining the ‘identicalness’ meaning in lexical uses, grammaticalized into various markers of ‘likeness’. The newly emerging markers include particles of diverse functions, e.g. adjectivizer, adverbializer, comitative, etc.; sentential endings, e.g. attenuative modal and exclamative; and clausal connectives marking hypotheticality. New meanings of the grammaticalized forms are varying degrees of similarity in the continuum between the polar concepts of SAME and DIFFERENT. The grammatical status and semantics of each of these markers are crucially dependent on the participating particles. We have also seen that certain forms thrive without competitors, whereas others suffer from competition with other forms of similar function and are losing supremacy to them. Considering that the two corpus sources are less than a century apart, this shows how fast linguistic change can proceed, despite the fact that cross-linguistically there are many grammatical markers whose grammaticalization processes have taken many centuries or often stayed unchanged for an extended length of time.

#### **References**

- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere D. Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldemann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt, and Thomas Stolz. 1993. *Conceptual Shift: A Lexicon of Grammaticalization Processes in African Languages*. AAP 34/35. Universität zu Köln.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003[1993]. *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KAIST KORTERM Corpus. Web accessible corpus developed by CS Lab, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology. <http://morph.kaist.ac.kr/kcp/>. Accessed between July 2003 and February 2004.
- Lee, Hyo Sang. 2002. Grammaticalization, lexicalization and unidirectionality: With reference to the development of some adjectives in Korean. Paper presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference, April 3-6, 2002, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München and Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Lord, Carol. 1973. Serial verbs in transition. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4(3): 269-296.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammatization in Lahu. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. 2, 383-454. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2002. From silence to grammar: Grammaticalization of ellipsis in Korean. Paper presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference, April 3-6, 2002, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2003. Particle selection in Korean auxiliary formation. Paper presented at the 32nd LASSO Annual Meeting, October 17-19, 2003, The University of Texas-Pan American, Edinburg, TX.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1980. Meaning-change in the development of grammatical markers. *Language Science* 2: 44-61.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In Raymond Hickey (ed.) *Motives for Language Change*, 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seongha Rhee  
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies & Stanford University  
Building 260 Room 239  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94

srhee@hufs.ac.kr, shrhee@stanford.edu